



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,846	10/17/2003	Yelena Nabutovsky	A03P3002-US1	9561
24473	7590	12/22/2006		
STEVEN M MITCHELL PACESETTER INC 701 EAST EVELYN AVENUE SUNNYVALE, CA 94086			EXAMINER FLORY, CHRISTOPHER A	
			ART UNIT 3762	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/22/2006	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	Application No. 10/687,846	Applicant(s) NABUTOVSKY, YELENA	
	Examiner Christopher A. Flory	Art Unit 3762	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-28.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1. Applicant's arguments filed 17 November 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stoop et al. Applicant argues that Stoop et al. does not disclose determining a difference between morphologies of at least 2 PVCs. However, by Applicant's own admission at the top of page two of the correspondence filed 10 July 2006, certain embodiments of Stoop et al. do consider T-wave morphology in performing calculations to determine whether to deliver preventative therapy. Therefore, Examiner maintains that the original rejection for arguments made of record and restated below is proper, as Stoop et al. clearly discloses using a difference in morphologies to determine whether to deliver preventative therapy (column 2, lines 10-50), since the time derivative curve of T-wave amplitude morphology as taught by Stoop et al. is nonetheless a measure of signal morphology. Although a T-wave follows the first contraction, it also precedes any subsequent PVCs, and in this way influences and is related to a PVC. 2. Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stoop et al. (US Patent 6,370,431). Regarding claims 1-12 and 23-28, Stoop et al. discloses a method of detecting and preventing ventricular arrhythmias comprising detecting at least two PVCs, determining a difference between their morphologies, and comparing said morphology difference to a predetermined threshold to determine whether to deliver preventative therapy (column 2, lines 10-50); further comprising a step of determining a difference between the coupling intervals of the at least two PVCs and comparing the difference to a predetermined threshold to determine whether to deliver preventative therapy (column 9, line 47 through column 10, line 10); further comprising a step of adjusting the threshold values based on recently detected physiological events (column 5, line 45 through column 7, line 59; column 10, lines 48-54); and delivering preventative therapy in the form of overdrive pacing when the analysis of the PVC parameters indicates that therapy should be delivered (column 2, lines 42-50; column 10, lines 11-54). Further regarding claims 9 and 10, Stoop et al. states the coupling interval as referring to "the interval from the prior R wave to the VES to the current QT interval," (column 9, lines 60-62) where the term QT "embraces both the QRS portion and T wave portion of the ventricular signal" (column 3, lines 60-63). It is understood that this is a disclosure of R-R coupling intervals. However, as seen in Fig. 1 the disclosed device of Stoop et al. also comprises P-wave sense circuitry (25) and, so long as the definition of coupling interval remains consistent, would be capable of using P-R intervals instead of the stated R-R intervals for a functional equivalent result well known in the art. Further regarding claim 11, Stoop et al. discloses a method for obtaining depolarization information for the current cycle and comparing it to the template generated during the learning phase which involves compiling values of the QT dispersion in different rate bins and determining the difference of respective wave form amplitudes along successive time increments by subtracting amplitude values and integrating over the time domain (column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 17). It is well known that the time integral of a curve in the Cartesian plane is the mathematical equivalent to the area under said curve, and a subtraction of the time integral of one curve (e.g. the current QRS waveform) from that of another (e.g. a stored template) is representative of the difference of the areas under those curves. Therefore, Stoop et al. is understood to disclose a method of analyzing the morphology of the current QRS complex with a previously stored template (which is based on at least 2 previous measurements) by means of comparing the difference in areas under the current waveform and stored template (Figs. 4A-D and 5A-D). Stoop et al. further discloses weighting the results obtained for use in the subsequent determination of intervention (column 9, lines 20-46; column 10, lines 11-34), which is taken to be an equivalent step to assigning a match score that is proportional to the difference in areas under the compared QRS curves. Regarding claims 13-22, Stoop et al. discloses an apparatus (Fig. 1, pacemaker system) configured to detect and prevent ventricular arrhythmias comprising a detecting means or sensing circuit (sense circuits 24-26) for detecting at least two PVCs; a processing means (signal processor 27, control microprocessor 20)) for determining morphological and coupling interval differences; a comparing means to compare said differences to predetermined thresholds; and a delivery means or pacing circuit (ventricular and atrial pulse generators 15 and 18) for delivering preventative therapy based on said comparisons. (Column 4, lines 7-41)...

George Manuel
 Primary Examiner